DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 521 PS 023 911

AUTHOR	Schmitz, Stephen
TITLE	PARADISU: Program Evaluation of the Micronesian Language Institute's Guam Family English Literacy Program.
INSTITUTION	Guam Univ., Mangilao. Micronesian Language Inst.
PUB DATE	Aug 95
CONTRACT	T003J20088
NOTE	33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Pacific Education Conference (12th, Koror, Republic of Palau, August 1-3, 1995).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Adult Literacy; Elementary Education; English Instruction; Family Programs; *Limited English Speaking; *Literacy; *Literacy Education; *Out of School Youth; Parents; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Social Services
IDENTIFIERS	Chamorros; Chuukese People; *Family English Literacy; *Guam; Palauan People

ABSTRACT

In 1992, the Micronesian Language Institute established the PARADISU program, whose purpose was to strengthen and develop the English literacy and school participation skills of, and the school survival and success of children from, Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan families living on Guam through direct instruction and other activities. The program served parents and out-of-school youth. This report evaluates the program in its third and final year of operation to assess its productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness. The evaluation was based on interviews of staff members and participants, observations of training sessions, review of documents, and data collected during formal evaluation. The program had four staff members. Its activities included: (1) recruiting program participants from traditionally underserved populations; (2) training participants in family literacy; (3) writing a literacy training manual; and (4) distributing a newsletter. The evaluator judged the program overall to be effective in its third year. Strengths of the program were the commitment and expertise of the staff and a training program focused on building the capacity of parents. Identified weaknesses included lack of coordinated effort within the program and with outside agencies, a chronic attendance problem, and unclear philosophy and strategy. These weaknesses, however, did not prevent effective completion of the program's goals of increasing the English proficiency of, and the understanding of the public school system by, Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan parents and out-of-school youth. The program was not renewed; nevertheless, recommendations for future literacy efforts are offered. These include considering the philosophy of the program; stressing cooperation, unity of purpose, and sharing of ideas; focusing greater resources on recruitment and assessment; and planning beyond the life of the program. (TM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 392 521

PARADISU

Program Evaluation of
The Micronesian Language Institute's

Guam Family English Literacy Program

University of Guam
Grant Number T003J20088
Fiscal Year 1994-95 and Summary Evaluation

Stephen Schmitz, Ph.D.

Project PARADISU, Micronesian Language Institute
University of Guam, Mangilao, Guam 96923
(671) 735-2411

August, 1995

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Schmitz
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

PS 023911

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Paradisu Program 3

Evaluation Design 7

Evaluation Findings 11
- Overall Strengths of the Program 11
- Overall Weaknesses of the Program 12
- How Effective was the Program? 13
- How Efficient was the Program? 15
- How Appropriate was the Program? 16
- What were the Strength and Weaknesses of the Various Strands? 17

Conclusions and Recommendations 23

Attachments 28

Executive Summary

The Micronesian Language Institute's PARADISU, Title VII Family Literacy Project grant application was successful and was funded for a three-year cycle beginning July 1, 1992. The purpose of PARADISU is to strengthen and develop the English literacy, school survival, school success, and school participation skills of a selected number of Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan families living on Guam through direct instruction and other program activities.

This report presents evaluation research findings of the program in its third and final year of operation, based on observations of the program's operation throughout the year as well as data collected through the formal evaluative processes of May - July, 1995. The evaluator conducted on-site interviews of each staff member and several parent participants and school officials. He also observed several training sessions and collected and reviewed a variety of PARADISU staff documents in order to build an assessment of the program's level of effort, productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness.

The PARADISU program employed 4 regular staff members: 1 Project Director/ Literacy Trainer for Chamorro, 1 Palauan Speaker Literacy Trainer, 1 Chuukese Speaking Literacy Trainer, and 1 Technical Assistant. PARADISU's 1994-95 program accomplishments included:

- Carrying out many of the training activities that were planned for the proposal.
- Convening a committed, knowledgeable and experienced staff.
- Recruiting program participants from populations traditionally underrepresented in local family literacy efforts.

- Providing family literacy training to almost 600 participants.
- Completing the *Literacy Training Manual*, including community background information, lesson ideas and resource materials used by each trainer, as well as a variety of resource materials translated into target-population languages.
- Organizing and cataloging the collected resources of the PARADISU program.
- Training a cadre of Literacy Aides to work in local Head Start programs.
- Recruiting local classroom teachers for Family Literacy Night activities.
- Writing and disseminating the MLI/PARADISU newsletter to enhance networking.

Overall, the PARADISU program was judged to be effective in its third year of operation. The evaluator was able to identify various strengths about the program, including staffing, expertise, and parental involvement. Several weaknesses were identified, including lack of coordinated effort, a chronic attendance problem, and unclear philosophy and strategy. Although these problems are worthy of note, they did not preclude the effective completion of the overarching goals of the family literacy program.

Several recommendations were made for future family literacy efforts. These recommendations included carefully considering the underlying philosophy of the program, working on cooperation, unity of purpose, and the sharing of ideas, focusing greater resources on recruitment and assessment, and planning beyond the life of the program.

I. PARADISU PROGRAM

History of the PARADISU Program

In the fall of 1991, in response to the local need and the call for new proposals from the U.S. Department of Education, the Micronesian Language Institute (MLI) of the University of Guam applied for federal grant assistance under the Title VII Family English Literacy Program authorized under the Bilingual Education Act (20 U.S.C. 3281-3341). The MLI's grant application was successful and was approved for three years of funding through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs (OBEMLA). PARADISU's funding cycle commenced on July 1, 1992.

The purpose of PARADISU is to strengthen and develop the English literacy, school survival, school success, and school participation skills of a selected number of Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan families living on Guam through direct instruction and other program activities.

The local needs and conditions in Guam that the program was conceived to address were described in the program's proposal document:

- Language training opportunities which attempt to help Micronesian LEP adults with their need for basic survival English training on Guam are virtually nonexistent for Micronesians who have not graduated from high school (Woo, Aguilar, & Spencer, 1991).

- Most LEP Chamorro, Palauan, and Chuukese adults living on Guam are not functionally literate in their first language. The reading and writing of basic directions, letters, reports, basic international symbols and signs, maps, medical prescriptions, menus, invoices, and filling out of simple job applications, visa applications, immigration forms, etc. is a struggle in any language (Woo, Aguilar, & Spencer, 1991).

- Their unfamiliarity with and inability to read and respond to school notices to the home, report cards, newsletters, invitations to school conferences, permission slips, school handbooks, progress reports of their children, etc., often get misinterpreted by school personnel. Judgments about the Micronesian parents and family by the educational establishment are often that "they" are simply "unreachable", "apathetic",

and/or "disinterested parents/family" (MRC 15 interviews with LOTE teachers, 1990, 1991).

- Often due to poor communication, poorly developed relationships between the home and the school, and sometimes culturally, out of respect for authority, Micronesian adults are often reluctant to forward comments to the school about their child's school progress, and to even ask basic questions about the local educational program. Logically, this situation is exacerbated by the fact that the vast majority of Guam DOE instructional personnel are not proficient in any of the Micronesian languages ("Towards the Year 21000", MLI Board of Directors Forum, 1991).

- In 1991, it was estimated that more than 5,000 immigrants from other Micronesian islands now live on Guam (Guam Bureau of Planning, 1991.) Rubenstein & Levin (1992) suggested that more than 7000 Micronesian migrants may reside on Guam, not including about 2,000 Palauans.

- Approximately 95% of all newly arriving Micronesian families are considered to be low-income (Guam Bureau of Planning, 1991).

- The literacy rate among newly arriving Micronesian adults living on Guam is estimated to be less than 50% (Woo, Aguilar, & Spencer, 1991)

- The incidence of alcoholism, unemployment, vehicular deaths associated with alcohol and drugs, suicide, and crimes of violence among Micronesian adults living on Guam are estimated to be disproportionately high compared with estimated for non-Micronesian adults (Guam Bureau of Planning, 1991)

Description of the PARADISU PROJECT

PARADISU in the Chamorro language is the word for "paradise". For the program, its name and logo symbolize the harmony which can be gained through learning, with literacy development as one of its vehicles.

Staffing: The PARADISU program in FY 1994-1995 employed 4 regular staff members: 1 Project Director/Chamorro Literacy Trainer/Curriculum Developer, 1 Palauan Speaking Literacy Trainer, 1 Chuukese Speaking Literacy Trainer, and 1

Administrative Assistant to help carry out all of its activities. (**Attachment A** of this report is a list of the employees and their respective roles on the project.)

Major Objectives. Overall, the PARADISU program has eight (8) major objectives. They are:

1.0 To provide direct instruction to Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan parents and out-of-school youth from non-literate or low literacy backgrounds with the intent of developing their proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing basic survival English.

2.0 To provide direct instruction to Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan LEP parents and out-of-school youth with the intent of developing their understanding of basic policies, procedures, priorities, organization, concepts, activities, and expectations of the Guam public school system so as to be able to better advocate for their students' learning needs.

3.0 To provide direct instruction to Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan LEP parents and out-of-school youth with the intent of developing their proficiency in understanding the language learning needs of their K-6 students to the degree that they are able to identify, organize, and successfully carry out a number of literacy promoting activities for K-6 LEP students.

4.0 To provide direct instruction and organization to Chamorro, Chuukese, and Palauan parents, out-of-school youth, and interested parents with the intent of developing them as Literacy Aides who could assume either paid or volunteer positions within the schools and various communities to facilitate: a) the development of proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing basic survival English among other LEP adults and out-of-school youth; b) the development of understanding of basic policies, procedures, priorities, organization, concepts, activities, and expectations of the Guam public school system, among others; and c) the development of proficiency in understanding the language learning needs of LEP K-6 students to the degree that they are able to identify, organize and successfully carry out a number of literacy promoting activities for these students.

5.0 To organize a network of committed organizations, agencies, and individuals concerned and involved with promoting literacy for parents and out-of-school youth throughout Guam to information-

share, joint problem-solve, promote public awareness, and strengthen current activities and efforts.

6.0 To organize a network of committed organizations, agencies, and individuals all concerned and involved with promoting literacy for parents and out-of-school youth throughout Guam to make good use of the trained Literacy Aides who are an outcome of this program and who will be able to effectively work with their peers and others to strengthen their literacy skills and knowledge about school matters.

7.0 To develop and refine a three-part curriculum for LEP parents and out-of-school youth which would address the following: a) their needs for a set of relevant activities, discussions, and practice trails aimed at developing their proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing basic survival English; b) their need for a sequence of lessons, discussions, activities, and sample materials for developing their understanding of basic policies, procedures, priorities, organization, concepts, activities, and expectations of the Guam public school system; and c) their need for training on a cluster of literacy promoting activities that they could successfully organize and carry out which should help develop the English language literacy skills of their students.

8.0 To operate and manage this program as effectively and efficiently as possible so as to realize all the program's objectives; and to stress collaboration and cost-savings measures in the carrying out of all program activities so as to maximize the potential for improved literacy on Guam.

PARADISU is organized around four (4) core interrelated strands under which all of the above program objectives are subsumed. They are:

STRAND A: **DIRECTION INSTRUCTION & LITERACY AID TRAINING**

STRAND B: **FACILITATION OF NETWORK AND GUAM-WIDE LITERACY CAMPAIGNS**

STRAND C: **CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

STRAND D: **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

This report presents evaluation research findings of the program in its third and final year of operation under the original OBEMLA grant. The evaluation is based on data collected in its fourth quarter of operation, 1995. The consultant selected by the PARADISU staff to conduct this evaluation has working familiarity with Guam and its various communities, and has an ongoing research agenda addressing education in Micronesia.

In keeping with the tone and format of previous evaluations, the evaluator attempted to accomplish the following goals for the staff:

- **Provide another "set of eyes" for the staff from which to view their work.**
- **Lend assistance in documenting the work of the PARADISU program.**
- **Help provide feedback to the staff on current operations.**
- **Assist the staff to gain greater alignment between what the written proposal states and what is actually occurring.**
- **Note contextual problems that have occurred during the operation of the program.**
- **Identify program strengths and weaknesses.**
- **Help recommend various mechanisms, tools, and procedures which if adopted might help improve how the program is operated, perceived, managed, documented.**
- **Summarize the accomplishments of the program for the third year and over the span of the three-year grant.**
- **Provide suggestions and guidelines for future literacy efforts in the region.**

The evaluator visited PARADISU program sites and activities throughout much of the program year, and attempted to assess the program based on long-term observations about the program as well as data collected during the formal evaluation period. The evaluator carried out a document review, several on-site observations of workshop sessions, individual interviews with each staff member, and review of the monitoring and quality control activities which the staff had conducted as part of their planned program activities. Some staff members had the opportunity to review the evaluation document before final submission; several comments and suggestions were incorporated into the final text.

Evaluation Focus

As in previous evaluations, an attempt to understand the ***effectiveness, efficiency,*** and ***appropriateness*** of the PARADISU program lead to a number of relevant questions. Answers to most of the questions were gathered from a number of sources. A summary of both the questions that formed the basic core of the evaluation and the method of inquiry used are listed in **Attachment B**.

Data Gathering Methods

Formal evaluative data was gathered by the evaluator during May - July of 1995. Each data gathering method employed for the evaluation progressed in the following manner:

1. Semi-structured interviews with each staff member - Each PARADISU staff member was asked to respond to a similar set of questions. The same evaluator conducted all of the interviews. The list of questions contained approximately 10 items. Questions included in the interview addressed: how well the project had completed their activities and met their objectives as delineated in their project proposals; their understanding regarding their role and the objectives of the PARADISU; problems each staff member had encountered in the fulfilling of

their perceived roles; how they viewed their abilities to serve the needs of the various community and parent groups; what program accomplishments they considered important or noteworthy; as an entire program, how well things had progressed organizationally, what had been accomplished, and what problems had been encountered. Each staff member was also invited to make whatever comments they wished to add to the evaluative data.

Each appointment time was scheduled with the agreement of the individual being interviewed. Interviews ranged from 25 minutes to 80 minutes in length. While the interview was in session, the evaluator freely took notes. Upon each interview's completion, the evaluator further refined his notes. The evaluator met with individual staff members for a second time after the completion of the preliminary report to gather additional data and solicit additional comments. Some staff were also interviewed by phone in order to clarify certain responses.

2. <u>On-site Observations of Training Events</u>

As in previous evaluations, the evaluator investigated the critical link between the program and the targeted parents and community members. The evaluator observed actual instruction to get a general sense of how the teaching and learning was taking place as a result of the program. The evaluator wanted to see how typical the instruction and use of instructional materials were within the program. The evaluator visited five training sessions at 3 schools, making every effort to not disrupt training that was in progress. The evaluator generally sat on the periphery of the main action to make observations while not disturbing the flow of the workshop. During two visits, the evaluator briefly interviewed three parents, four public school teachers, and an elementary school principal about their involvement in and perceptions of the PARADISU program.

3. Document Reviews - The Project Director made all the central program files available to the evaluators. The Administrative Assistant was available and helpful in locating various documents and materials. Among those documents that were reviewed were: the program proposal; the documentation of various activities by the project staff; previous evaluations of the program; and lists of the Guam community and network participants. A program manual for instruction was examined. Job descriptions and other materials from the initial planning phase of PARADISU were found to be out-of-date and inadequate in representing what was really going on. They were not used as a source of data.

Overall Evaluation Procedures Taken for Evaluation:

1. Met with PARADISU staff on individualized basis.
2. Organized response data gathering around identified issues.
3. Reviewed files and collected organizational data at PARADISU.
4. Discussed "Organizational Health" and preliminary evaluation with staff and collected additional response data.
5. Collected and summarized findings.
6. Submitted final written report complete with recommendations to Project Director.
7. Met with Project Director to clarify direction for follow-up.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

OVERALL STRENGTHS OF THE PARADISU PROGRAM

++ **Commitment of individual PARADISU staff members**

Each staff member of the PARADISU program continued in the third year to exhibit a strong commitment to their respective communities and to the goals and methods of the PARADISU program.

++ **Cultural and pedagogical expertise of the PARADISU staff members**

The program was staffed by individuals who are knowledgeable about Micronesian cultures and able to demonstrate learning and teaching strategies appropriate to local needs. The staff was open, flexible, and willing to attempt innovative approaches to literacy. Because of the attitudes, cultural expertise, and professionalism of the PARADISU staff, PARADISU participants felt competent, important, and respected.

++ **Training focused on building the capacity of parents**

The PARADISU Year Two Evaluation cited the overemphasis on passive learning and the presentation of information as a serious program weakness. This year, PARADISU staff realigned their strategies to emphasize the active participation of parents. Trainers worked to build a sense of efficacy among the community of parents. Participants became involved in training activities and were drawn into the literacy discussion. Parents worked on literacy activities side-by-side with their children. Parents were trained to take charge of family literacy in the home and to become literacy aides in the Head Start program. The strategic move towards parental involvement and facilitative training was entirely successful and a strong addition to the program.

OVERALL WEAKNESSES OF THE PARADISU PROGRAM

- **Lack of collective effort in training activities and curriculum development**

The general feeling among staff during the third year was that staff had failed to resolve the chronic difficulty of working in isolation. Each staff member worked independently to carry out their specific program responsibilities, and staff carried out many training activities together. Each trainer brought their own specific training activities to training sessions, but there was little sharing of ideas and communal planning. Staff members seldom knew what each other planned to do before training sessions. This is not to imply staff friction--on the contrary, the warm atmosphere of caring and mutual respect was laudable. The cooperative spirit, however, failed to manifest itself in the sharing of ideas and expertise.

There were many unfortunate consequences of this oversight. Collective feedback from peers would have built stronger activity sessions. Staff members each had a particular cultural expertise, but they failed to benefit from the aptitudes of others. Training session activities were not coordinated or organized in a thematic or sensical manner.

- **Failure to resolve a chronic attendance problem**

Each of the three years of the program, the evaluation has mentioned low attendance at training sessions. Reacting to attendance problems, the PARADISU staff changed emphases and strategies, yet inconsistent attendance continued to plague the program. The evaluator attended one session that had over 60 participants and another that had only two.

Underlying the attendance problem was the strategy of relying on school principals and site personnel to promote the program and recruit participants. As the interest and commitment of principals and school personnel waxed and waned, so did program attendance.

- **Lack of a strategy to share expertise, materials, methods, and experiences with the larger professional community**

To an outsider, it is startling how much knowledge is shared among the PARADISU staff. Over the three years of the program, staff have become impressively adept at understanding, relating to, and training program participants. PARADISU staff have amassed an impressive collection of strategies, materials, and resources pertinent to family literacy in Micronesia. As the program draws to a close, it is disappointing and disturbing to realize that the collective knowledge and collected resources of PARADISU are likely to die with the program. Staff have made no plans to distribute materials within the educational community or share their expertise with colleagues.

Some sharing strategies were employed to involve the public schools in literacy activities that would continue beyond the program's life. Hopefully, parents and teachers will both see the value in continuing literacy training independent of the PARADISU program. The Micronesian Language Institute may be able to acquire funding to promote literacy and utilize the PARADISU collection in support of continued community literacy efforts.

How Effective was the Program?

PARADISU planned four integrated strands under which all of the program activities fell. Staff initiated program activities in Year One, then modified strategies in Year Two to enhance quality and concentrate services. During Year Three, staff tried to better coordinate the program, develop and document the program curricula, strengthen networking strategies, and assess program efficacy. The evaluation will address each of the four integrated strands in turn, highlighting significant accomplishments and noting problem areas.

Direct Instruction

Direct instruction was PARADISU's primary strategy for promoting literacy among the target populations. PARADISU staff were successful in designing literacy curricula and instructional programs that were appropriate for and effective with all target communities. The staff demonstrated a remarkable and laudable talent for crafting literacy instruction towards specific cultural expectations and the literacy needs of target groups. Classroom teachers became effective literacy educators in PARADISU-sponsored "Family Literacy Nights." A program manual was developed to document PARADISU's many materials and strategies and sponsor

program consistency and the sharing of ideas. The PARADISU materials collection was catalogued and organized. PARADISU successfully expanded literacy efforts to concentrate on the three groups targeted in the original project proposal. A Head Start program brought family literacy efforts to a new segment of the community.

PARADISU trainers demonstrated a model of parent-community-school cooperative education that is new to Guam and the public school system. The program was unique because it introduced chronically underserved family populations to the schools that serve them, involving families and teachers in joint family literacy activities. By the end of the third year of the program, at least 1-2 schools had begun to take independent responsibility for continuing family literacy activities beyond the life of the program.

Problems derived from disruptions in the support of principals and school personnel and the consequent inconsistent attendance at PARADISU activities. PARADISU staff assessed client needs and program efficacy by polling parents but did not use the products of the assessment to significantly modify PARADISU program activities.

Networking and Literacy Campaign Planning

Many of the attempts at networking by PARADISU staff were successful. Although a formal literacy network was not organized, the Head Start effort resulted in the development of a group of literacy aides for the Guam schools. School teachers became involved in the "Family Literacy Nights" activities. Health officials were recruited to offer activities on family health to various literacy groups. Distinct Palauan and Chuukese literacy groups were established. The University of Guam became involved in the literacy effort through the College of Education, the College of Agriculture, and the University Extension Office. Networking became especially successful during the final year of the program, when many earlier efforts came to fruition.

During the third program year, efforts aimed at the Palauan and Chuukese communities were particularly successful. As ethnic minorities and immigrants to Guam, these groups were particularly resistant to PARADISU's early recruitment efforts. Staff emphasized group cohesion, developed a sense of community, and

capitalized on informal contacts to bring these groups into the family literacy network.

Perceptions of the staff regarding networking and the literacy campaign, however, were ambivalent. Some staff felt great progress had been made in this area; others were frustrated by chronic attendance problems and the lack of support from Guam's Department of Education. Staff also voiced disappointment with the lack of progress in establishing a formal "literacy network." It is the opinion of the evaluator that much of the frustration about networking derived from ambiguous, unrealistic, and overly ambitious goals for the family literacy network. Clearly, each staff had different ideas about what "networking" entailed, yet these conceptual differences were not aired and explored. Furthermore, PARADISU staff never established a successful network among themselves (see ***Overall Weaknesses*** pg. 12).

Curriculum Development

PARADISU staff were highly successful in the area of curriculum development. During the first two years of the program, the staff amassed an superb collection of pedagogical strategies, literacy activities, and instructional materials related to Micronesian family literacy. Lessons, worksheets, and activities were compiled into a *Literacy Training Manual*; a bilingual *Handbook of Literacy and Student Achievement Activities for the LEP Home* was also finalized. Many activities were translated into the languages of target communities. During year three, staff organized and catalogued developed materials while continuing new curricular development efforts. The professional expertise of the staff in the areas of curricular methods for LEP students, Micronesian cultures and family literacy was impressive.

How Efficient was the Program?

The program made good use of limited funds and manpower; there was little waste, duplication of effort, or overlapping programs. Collaboration and coordination of staff was evident when conducting workshops, but there was less effort expended on the sharing of ideas, instructional materials, and curriculum development.

The organization of materials, files, resources, and the training manual were important steps in improving efficiency and sharing resources. Unfortunately, the newly-organized resources were underutilized. Many materials were bought at considerable cost. Others represented a great deal of development time. Yet, many materials were seldom, if ever, used. Public school teachers are unaware of PARADISU's vast collection of materials and the materials are not available for general distribution.

Although the organization of activities was efficiently planned, attendance at training sessions was inconsistent. Many hours of careful planning were spent on Family Literacy Nights that were poorly attended, yet preparation was necessary because attendance was so unpredictable. Inconsistent attendance wasted valuable resources and discouraged and disheartened the staff.

Several issues remained unclear to the evaluator regarding how the staff spent planning time. Staff seemed diligent and occupied themselves with preparation for training. Some staff complained of the time pressures of a heavy workload. Others were unwilling to take on new tasks like recruiting because they felt they could not spare time from planning. Yet, during literacy training, staff repeatedly presented the same activities. Seldom did staff spend more than 8 hours weekly actually involved in training.

How Appropriate was the Program?

A major strength of the PARADISU program was the alignment of program objectives with specific client populations. Staff had anticipated recruitment of a cadre of long-term participants, but modified training sessions to handle groups consisting primarily of newcomers. Staff frequently asked informal questions to assess participant needs in addition to relying on information gleaned from client needs-assessment surveys. The new Head Start literacy aide program was a particularly clever matching of program to population needs.

Parents, students, pubic school teachers and principals spoke positively of the program. One principal mentioned the importance of children seeing their parents involved in school activities. A classroom teacher at a particularly well-attended session noted,

> I can't believe all these parents are here. We had Parents' Day and almost nobody showed up. We really need parents to support us and work with their kids at home and it is really frustrating because they don't. This is great!

A father attending his first Family Literacy Night explained,

> I came because my children asked me to. Now that I am here, I am glad I came. I guess school is different now--this looks kind of fun.

What Obstacles Hampered Program Effectiveness?

Many of the problems reported by staff grew out of the issue of weak coordination between PARADISU and other agencies, most notably the Department of Education. Networking difficulties, postponements, inconsistent attendance, locked buildings, planning difficulties, and several disappointments resulted from problems in identifying agency and school contacts and securing their cooperation. These circumstances were beyond the control of the PARADISU staff.

PARADISU staff found themselves on the horns of a dilemma. PARADISU was charged with developing a self-sustaining capacity for literacy training among parents, teachers, and the Guam public schools system. PARADISU staff could not terminate their relations with outside agencies because it was these same agencies whose responsibility and capacity PARADISU was trying to develop. Yet, literacy efforts were often frustrated by the listless cooperation of these groups. In future efforts, staff should consider how to make PARADISU more independent of other agencies, especially in matters of client recruitment, while continuing to work within the interagency network.

What were the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Various Strands?

STRAND A: DIRECT INSTRUCTION

Strengths and Accomplishments

- Trainers organized, designed, and delivered training that addressed the educational needs, interests, and cultures of the participants.
- The instruction targeted communities that have been underrepresented in past educational efforts.

- In the course of program year three, staff provided training and assistance to about 589 participants, an increase of more than 430 participants from year two.
- Staff training of Head Start aides perpetuated literacy benefits beyond the life of the PARADISU program.
- Other participants, most notably classroom teachers, were brought into the training process.
- Family literacy training included children, parents, and public school teachers working together in literacy activities.
- The program staff provided bilingual training and assistance to Palauan, Chuukese, and Chamorro families.

Weaknesses and Identified Problems

- Staff seldom shared ideas, strategies, or lessons. No time was set aside for staff to observe each other's training activities. Staff received little feedback from colleagues or other professionals. When the program was evaluated by other professionals, staff did not seem to *use* the feedback to significantly alter the strategies of the program. Staff neither observed the activities of the participating public school teachers nor made use of them in subsequent presentations. There seemed to be little difference between year two and year three activities.
- Attendance at training sessions was inconsistent due to a reliance on other agencies for recruitment. PARADISU staff failed to use some obvious outreach approaches or suggest them to the schools.
- Assessment and evaluation activities were not conducted on a regular basis or used as a basis for planning instruction. There were few opportunities for participant feedback.
- There was no clear link between training activities and long term planning. Sessions appeared more as individual workshops than parts of a larger strategic effort.

STRAND B: NETWORKING AND LITERACY CAMPAIGN PLANNING

Strengths and Accomplishments

- Program staff continued to disseminate a newsletter and program brochure among members and community organizations.
- Parents, teachers, and school administrators from Head Start and the Guam Department of Education were involved in training activities.
- Network links with the University of Guam, community churches, the Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority (GHURA), and Head Start were continued and strengthened.
- The program continued to solicit donations from community businesses.
- Participation in the program by children, parents, and teachers increased dramatically.
- The Parent Volunteer Program was successfully initiated; about 34 adult volunteers received training.

Weaknesses and Identified Problems

- Networking seemed to be an extemporaneous and informal activity; there was no apparent long-term networking strategy.
- Formal networking links beyond the life of the PARADISU program were not established and solidified. PARADISU staff have not planned for what will happen after PARADISU is discontinued. Much of the program's emphasis on capacity building was overlooked while staff concentrated on literacy training activities.

- There is no formal mechanism to share PARADISU's ideas, materials, and resources beyond year three; accumulated knowledge and expertise may die with the program.

- Classroom teachers contributed many interesting and creative activities to the training sessions. PARADISU staff, however, failed to note teacher-developed activities and subsequently integrate them into the PARADISU program.

STRAND C: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Strengths and Accomplishments

- Staff completed a *Literacy Training Manual* containing background information on each of the three cultural communities (Palauan, Chuukese, and Chamorro), lesson plans, and resource materials.

- Trainers created materials such as story booklets or literacy posters to assist in literacy training activities. Many of these activities were translated into languages of the target cultures.

- Staff organized and catalogued the accumulated PARADISU literacy materials collection.

Weaknesses and Identified Problems

- Many of the materials in the *Literacy Training Manual* and training activities were not adapted to emphasize target cultural groups and different learning styles.

- There are no plans to share materials, resources, or the *Literacy Training Manual* with the larger teaching community.

- There was little coordination and feedback between staff in the development of materials and resources. Each trainer had a group of personally-tailored activities for their own cultural group, but these ideas were seldom shared or modified for use with other groups.

- There was no overarching strategy or philosophy to the curriculum. Curriculum development, materials development, training and the *Training Manual* seemed to be more of a collection of individual activities than a coordinated plan of action.

- Public school teachers were included as presenters in training sessions, but no effort was extended to document teacher participation or incorporate their strategies into later sessions. While many teachers learned from PARADISU, the staff seemed to learn little from teacher participants.

STRAND D: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Strengths and Accomplishments

- Staff began to organize materials and document the work and progress of PARADISU's various efforts.

- Basic program management systems continued to be reassessed and redefined.

- Staff members documented each site's activities, progress, and attendance.

- Staff finished the compilation of the *Literacy Training Manual* and the organization of materials and resources. Program files were centralized.

Weaknesses and Identified Problems

- Training reports were not completed in a standardized fashion. Training reports and activities were not shared among staff for the purposes of feedback, quality control or creative brainstorming.

- Staff seldom reflected jointly about the goals, activities, or progress of PARADISU.

- The monitoring of program activities was relatively absent in year three. Staff activities were inconsistently documented and seldom shared.

- Planning and budgeting did not allow for the termination of the program. No decisions were made about what to do with program materials. There was no

follow-up of program activities. Some staff felt that their contributions were not acknowledged.

In summary, the development and presentation of family literacy training activities was both PARADISU's strength and its weakness. Training activities were effective and valuable for teachers and parents. Yet the focus on literacy training was often at the expense of other responsibilities such as recruitment, networking, and capacity building.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PARADISU funding has been discontinued after the three years of the original grant. Many staff have made commitments to other programs and activities, and continuation of a modified PARADISU program awaits new grant funding.

The following comments and recommendations are written for the benefit of staff members who may continue with a subsequent modified program as well as other others participating in future literacy efforts. Real progress was made over the life of the program and many lessons learned. The following conclusions and recommendations are made in the spirit of experimentation, sharing and cooperative learning manifest in the PARADISU program.

STRAND A: DIRECT INSTRUCTION

PARADISU was most effective in the area of direct instruction. Sessions were interesting, entertaining, and richly informative about literacy education. Participants left training sessions enthusiastic about the education of their children and competent in new literacy skills. Parents acquired a strong sense of efficacy as participants in and contributors to the education of their children.

- PARADISU and the Micronesian Language Institute are based on the belief that literacy skills can empower individuals from disenfranchised cultures, and that bilingual education is a powerful vehicle for enhancing literacy. Staff assumed that everyone understood and agreed upon these key issues, but it is doubtful that everyone operated from the same set of assumptions. Staff began the program without serious reflection about philosophy, empowerment, literacy development, culture and community. Training activities and evaluations focused more on content than on processes of empowerment. Each trainer worked individually within their own community but there was no sense of strategic organization or unity of purpose.

A guiding philosophy gives a program unity and focus. It provides an overall structure from which trainers can plan lessons that hang together strategically.

PARADISU staff themselves indicated that this overarching philosophy was lacking and did not provide a coordinated focus.

- Those training sessions that were successful combined several key attributes:
  - several staff offered a choice of individualized activities
  - parents participated along with their children in the same activity
  - classroom teachers were integrated into the training activities
  - school administrators fully backed the program and helped recruit participants
  - activities were process oriented and required active involvement
  - the training session was highly organized and the pace was brisk
  - there was no lecturing--staff and participants communicated as equals
  - parents were made to appear competent in front of their children

Unsuccessful training sessions suffered from several shortcomings:

- there were few choices of activities and many activities involved lecturing to parents about content areas
- few trainers were involved
- parents watched their children participate but did not become involved
- weak administrator support at the school caused disorganization and poor attendance
- classroom teachers appeared apathetic or disinterested
- activities entailed passive participation
- parents were not at ease or appeared incompetent in front of their children
- sessions were disorganized; attending parents were given little direction

- Program planning and assessment go hand in hand. PARADISU emphasized curriculum planning at the expense of thorough assessment. Many assessment ideas were fielded but few were followed through (e.g., individual portfolios). Staff were never entirely certain that the program effectively met client needs.

STRAND B: NETWORKING

- Attendance at training workshops was a problem over the life of the program. Planning, organization, instruction, and resource allocation were all impacted by inconsistent attendance. The staff strategy was to concentrate on training and

leaving recruitment to site coordinators. This plan was ineffective because recruiting support was unreliable. Lack of recruitment resources put PARADISU at the mercy of other agents. Planning became passive and dependent. The most serious consequence of poor attendance was increasingly poor morale among trainers.

- Networking begins at home. Although the idea of establishing a formal literacy network is laudable, it is difficult to translate networking objectives into a concrete plan of action. PARADISU staff made progress in enlisting the support of disparate client populations that are notorious for their very lack of participation in school programs. The capacity of the staff to network within the informal communities was laudable. The hesitancy of the staff to network at home--learning from each other and PARADISU's participating classroom teachers--was disappointing.

- One goal of PARADISU was perpetuating the literacy network beyond the life of the program by building capacity among other agencies. Lack of planning beyond the life of the program frustrated the completion of this goal. PARADISU could have provided more impetus in this area. Several of PARADISU's initiatives, however, were also ignored or rebuffed by other agencies.

- Planning and programming exclusively focused on what should transpire over the budget life of the program. Little attention was paid to several important questions about wrapping the program up. How might the community network be perpetuated? What should happen to program materials and the *Literacy Training Manual*? How might program expertise be transferred to other community agencies?

- One aspect of literacy education is training parents and community resource personnel in the strategies and techniques of promoting family literacy. PARADISU's accomplishments in this area were notable. A closely related aspect of literacy is education and promotion--informing the community at large about the importance of literacy and the accessibility of literacy resources. PARADISU staff did not focus on this aspect of community literacy.

Future program staff should consider carefully the feasibility of mounting a literacy campaign, utilizing local television, radio, parish bulletins, church groups, compact

impact agencies, public health services, and other service agencies to inform the larger community about the importance of literacy efforts. Radio and television programs, posters, letters, and other media could use Palauan, Chuukese, and Chamorro languages to build group cohesion and keep communities informed of literacy events in their native languages. Parents might have become more involved in literacy training activities had they understood the importance of literacy in the home and their central role in family literacy.

Admittedly, PARADISU staff hesitated to take the initiative in matters of client recruitment. After all, one of the goals of the program was to build this capacity within PARADISU's affiliates. Future efforts might resolve this dilemma by providing various agencies with materials, training, and support in the area of recruitment. A PARADISU sponsored inter-agency workshop on recruitment and networking might be an option. Another strategy might be joint PARADISU-agency recruitment activities. Such proactive methods involve and empower participating agencies.

- One key to PARADISU's success was the ability of staff to keep a large program *informal* and *personal*. Many participants were visibly uncomfortable at the beginning of training sessions. Staff immediately put participants at ease by approaching them informally and communicating warmly and personally. Training was non-threatening. Participants did not appear at the center of attention. Participants were never put on the spot.

- The Palauan and Chuukese trainers became particularly adept at exploiting group solidarity and group cohesiveness to make informal networking effective. Minority community status became an asset to networking and contributed to a sense of cultural dignity and pride. During training, participants were approached as cultural emissaries, cultural experts, and cultural preservationists, further enhancing their sense of worth and dignity. Linking literacy and empowerment to cultural pride and group solidarity was a notable breakthrough.

- PARADISU initiated many evaluative strategies but assessment never became *prescriptive* in the sense of identifying community needs and devising strategies directly linked to meeting those needs. Future programs should investigate more

thoroughly the specific needs of target communities, and then devise strategies directly linked to those needs.

In summary, the PARADISU program was evaluated to be successful. Especially in the third year of operation, substantial numbers of parents from specific target populations were successfully recruited into the literacy effort and trained in several literacy strategies via direct instruction. PARADISU successfully trained Head Start aides to perpetuate literacy training beyond the life of the program. Pedagogical coordination, assessment, and recruitment strategies were not entirely successful, and the PARADISU staff might have strengthened the program's participation in each of these areas. These weaknesses, however, did not seriously detract from the overall efficacy of the program in providing literacy training to the underserved Chamorro, Palauan, and Chuukese populations of Guam.

Attachment A

PARADISU PROGRAM STAFF

Program Year 1994-95

ARLENE C. S. DIAZ,
PARADISU Project Director and Literaacy Trainer for Chamorro

CANISIUS TKEL FILIBERT,
Literacy Trainer for Palauan

ZANDER DAVID REFILONG,
Literacy Trainer for Chuukese

ZINA CASTENEDA REYES
Technical Assistant

Attachment B

Core Questions of the Evaluation and Methods of Inquiry

QUESTIONS:	METHODS OF INQUIRY:
MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS	
1. Did the program do what it said it would? Did the PARADISU complete all the activities it proposed?	1.1 Review program and program proposal against staff documentation and reports.
	1.2 Verify with community members and training participants.
2. Were the program objectives met?	2.1 Look for what evidence exists that shows meeting of objectives.
	2.2 Discuss with staff what things they looked for as measures of success?
3. Ability to gather and use feedback.	3.1 Look at methods used to gather feedback.
	3.2 Review activities that were planned and/or modified based on feedback gathered.

MEASURES OF EFFICIENCY

1. Were the program and projects well managed? How many of the following were evident: well understood systems for information dissemination, problem solving, supervision, evaluation? Clarity regarding roles?	1.1 Review project management systems set in place. 1.2 Review with staff their job descriptions. 1.3 Review with each team member how well they understand the priorities and procedures of the total program.
2. Was the program cost-effective? Were duplications of effort kept to a minimum? Where appropriate was there collaboration and coordination among the individual projects?	2.1 Review evidence of coordination among staff members. 2.2 Review coordination between PARADISU and other Guam programs.

MEASURES OF APPROPRIATENESS

1. Did the program address the most important needs?	1.1 Review methods used to assess needs. 1.2 Review results of needs assessment.
2. Was the service delivery model based on data gathered through real needs sensing activities?	2.1 Look at evidence that service delivery model was designed to address specific needs.